WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—FACIAL DISFIGUREMENT.—The claimant suffered a laceration of the scalp due to the catching of her hair by a revolving shaft near which she was working. This resulted in a scar across the forehead from ear to ear, and serious facial disfigurement. Her earning capacity was not shown to be impaired thereby. *Held*, that an award of $1000 by the State Industrial Commission, for the facial disfigurement alone, was valid. *Erickson v. Preuss* (1918, N. Y.) 119 N. E. 555.

The object of most compensation acts is to make compensation for loss of earning power, and such was the policy of the New York law prior to 1916, when an amendment provided for an award in case of "serious facial or head disfigurement." Concurrent awards for disfigurement and for loss of earning power are now permissible.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—INJURY "ARISING OUT OF" THE EMPLOYMENT—CONCUSSION FROM EXPLOSION OF ENEMY AIRCRAFT'S BOMB.—The plaintiff, a potman in the defendant's employ, being engaged in cleaning a brass door plate on the street door of the defendant's public house, was slightly injured by concussion from the explosion in another street of a bomb dropped by German air raiders. In his suit under the Workmen's Compensation Act to recover for the injury sustained, the trial court allowed a recovery. An appeal by the defendant was allowed by the Court of Appeal on the ground that, since there was no evidence of special risk in the work the plaintiff was doing, the injury did not arise out of the employment within the meaning of the act. (1917, C. A.) 144 L. T. 111. The applicant then appealed to the House of Lords. *Held*, that the injury did not arise out of the employment. *Allcock v. Rogers* (H. L.) [1918] Weekly Notes 96; 144 L. T. Jour. 401.

Compensable injuries are those (1) "arising out of" and (2) " in the course of" the employment. Earlier decisions had seemed to render almost indistinguishable these two conditions of liability. See *Thom v. Sinclair* [1917] A. C. 127, discussed in (1917) 27 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 143; *Dennis v. J. A. White & Co.* [1917] A. C. 479, discussed in (1918) 16 MICH. L. REV., 179; also (1918) 30 JURID. REV., 162. The principal case indicates that a distinction does still exist and that the accident must arise out of, as well as in the course of, employment to impose liability.